

BOARD OF DESIGN REVIEW MINUTES

March 28, 2002

CALL TO ORDER: Vice-Chairman Hal Beighley called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive

ROLL CALL: Present were Board Members Hal Beighley, Mimi Doukas, Ronald Nardoza and Jennifer Shipley. Chairman Stewart Straus and Board Members Cecelia Antonio and Monty Edberg were excused.

Senior Planner John Osterberg, Associate Planner Scott Whyte, Associate Planner Liz Shotwell, Transportation Engineer Don Gustafson, Assistant City Attorney Ted Naemura and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

VISITORS:

Vice-Chairman Beighley read the format for the meeting and asked if any member of the audience wished to address the Board on any non-agenda item. There was no response.

Senior Planner John Osterberg pointed out that the applicant had requested a continuance of BDR 2001-0213 – Beaverton High School Cafeteria and Parking Lot Expansion.

STAFF COMMUNICATION:

Associate Planner Scott Whyte indicated that there were no staff communications.

OLD BUSINESS:

CONTINUANCES:

Vice-Chairman Beighley opened the Public Hearing and read the format of the hearing. There were no disqualifications of Board Members. No one in the audience challenged the right of any Board Member to hear any agenda items or participate in the hearing or requested that the hearing be postponed to a later date. He asked if there were any ex parte contact, conflict of interest or disqualifications in any of the hearings on the agenda.

A. **BDR 2002-0198 – BEAVERTON SCHOOL DISTRICT PROPOSED TRANSPORTATION AND SUPPORT CENTER DESIGN REVIEW**

(Continued from March 14, 2002)

Public Hearing is closed; draft Land Use Order subject to review.

This application for design review has been submitted for the development of a transportation and support center for storing and maintaining Beaverton School District buses. The Beaverton School District plans to store and maintain approximately 130 large buses and 70 small buses in a new parking lot to be located north of the existing building on-site, with the addition of approximately 185 new parking spaces for employees and visitors west of the existing building. The existing building would remain on-site, but would be remodeled to create maintenance bays for buses and administration offices for staff. The development site is generally located south of NW Twin Oaks Drive, east of NW 167th Place and north of Willow Creek, and is more specifically identified as Tax Lots 200, 300, 400 and 900 on Washington County Assessor's Map 1N1-31AD. The site is approximately 13.84 acres in size and is within the Light Industrial (LI) zone, where transit storage and auto service, both major and minor, within enclosed buildings, are permitted outright.

Associate Planner Scott Whyte referred to the Staff Report dated March 28, 2002, providing a draft Land Use Order for the consideration of the Board of Design Review. He briefly discussed the decision made by the Board of Design Review at their meeting of March 14, 2002, emphasizing that the Public Hearing is closed and no additional testimony will be accepted. Observing that staff had followed instructions to prepare and submit a draft land use order with regard to this application, he noted that this document should be reviewed and approved at this time. He clarified that a decision must be made as to whether the draft land use order accurately reflects the intent of the decision made by the Board of Design Review at the previous meeting on March 14, 2002. He observed that both Mr. Edberg and Chairman Straus, who had been in attendance of the March 14, 2002 meeting could not attend this meeting but had submitted written comments in support of the draft land use order. He then referred to the written comments received from Board Member Edberg and Chairman Straus. He also pointed out that Chairman Straus had submitted several suggestions with regard to some structural changes to the draft land use order. Concluding, he offered to respond to questions.

Mr. Nardozza referred to Condition of Approval No. 18, observing that it had not been his intention to require that the chain link fence be eight feet in height.

Mr. Whyte informed Mr. Nardozza that this Condition of Approval has been taken verbatim from the tape, emphasizing that no additional testimony or new consideration is appropriate at this time.

Vice-Chairman Beighley requested clarification of whether a Variance would be required to exceed the height limitation of six feet.

Mr. Whyte advised Vice-Chairman Beighley that a building permit, rather than a Variance, would be necessary for the fence at eight feet.

In response to Mr. Nardozza's question, Ms. Shipley stated that while trees are typically required to be seven to eight feet at the time of planting, written comments provided by Chairman Straus does clarify a minimum of eight feet.

Mr. Whyte pointed out that the issue at this time requires a motion to either adopt or make revisions to the draft land use order.

Mr. Nardozza pointed out that the only necessary change would be the removal of the slats in the chain link fence.

Mr. Whyte referred to a change to the Draft Land Use Order suggested by Chairman Straus, specifically his reference to a "chain link fencing without slats".

Mr. Nardozza **MOVED** and Ms. Shipley **SECONDED** a motion to the draft Land Use Order for BDR 2001-0198, as prepared by staff, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 20, with a revision to Condition of Approval No. 18, as follows:

18. The applicant shall provide fencing or wall along all areas of the site boundary. Fencing abutting public roadways shall be chain-link **without slats**. All other perimeter shall be surrounded by a wall with a minimum height of eight feet. Walls shall be constructed of wood, decorative masonry, brick or a combination thereof.

On question, Mr. Whyte assured the Board that the written comments of Mr. Edberg and Chairman Straus are considered a part of the record.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED**, unanimously, with the exception of Vice-Chairman Beighley and Ms. Doukas, who abstained from voting on this issue.

6:54 p.m. – Transportation Engineer Don Gustafson and Assistant City Attorney Ted Naemura left.

B. BDR 2001-0179 – VOICESTREAM MONOPOLE @ SW 1ST STREET DESIGN REVIEW

(Continued from February 14, 2002)

This application for design review has been submitted for the construction of a 60-foot monopole in the design of a flagpole with associated equipment cabinets and landscaping. The proposed development is generally located on the south side of SW 1st Street, between SW Angel

Avenue and SW Watson Avenue, at 12650 SW 1st Street, and is more specifically described as Tax Lot 4200 of Washington County Tax Assessor's Map 1S1-16AD. The affected parcel is zoned Regional Center – Old Town (RC-OT) and totals approximately 0.11 acres in size. A decision for action on the proposed development shall be based upon the approval criteria listed in Development Code Section 40.10.15.3.C.

Associate Planner Liz Shotwell presented the Staff Report and briefly discussed the application, including the historic structure that is located on the site. Observing that the Planning Commission had voted to approve this proposal, she pointed out that they had recommended that the Board address certain issues with regard to the flag. She presented the materials board and made a correction to Condition of Approval No. 14 on page 16 of the Staff Report, as follows:

14. The applicant shall remove all gravel or materials imported for construction and return the site ~~returned~~ to pre-construction conditions within two weeks of project completion.

Concluding, Ms. Shotwell recommended approval, with certain Conditions of Approval, and offered to respond to questions.

Vice-Chairman Beighley requested further clarification of the issues staff is requesting the Board to review.

Ms. Shotwell advised Vice-Chairman Beighley that the applicant would be providing further information with regard to the size of the flag and the design of the monopole, adding that the Planning Commission had adopted a Condition of Approval specifying that the flag should be both proportionate to the height of the monopole and be well-maintained.

Ms. Doukas questioned whether Ms. Shotwell has any specific information with regard to flag size standards.

Ms. Shotwell advised Ms. Doukas that the standard size for a flag would be roughly one-quarter the size of the pole on which it is to be mounted, adding that the applicant would provide further information with regard to this issue.

APPLICANT:

LARRY SOTOMAYOR, representing *Communications Services, Inc.*, on behalf of *Voicestream Wireless*, distributed materials illustrating options with regard to flags. Observing that the standard for the width of a flag is one-quarter of the length of the pole on which it is to be mounted, he pointed out that the applicant intends to display a flag that is ten-feet tall by 15-feet wide on this 60-foot flagpole.

Ms. Doukas requested clarification of the origin of this standard.

Mr. Sotomayor advised Ms. Doukas that because he is unfamiliar with the protocol with regard to the display of flags it had been necessary to rely upon the expertise of the supplier. Observing that it is difficult to obtain flags that are substantial in size, he pointed out that the Planning Commission had been concerned that the flag be proportionate with the height of the flagpole.

Vice-Chairman Beighley requested further information with regard to the flagpole.

Mr. Sotomayor noted that while the original plans specified a certain manufacturer, *ValMount*, adding that the original pole would have been approximately two feet in diameter at the base, and tapered slightly. He pointed out that the handouts he had just distributed represents more accurately what this monopole would look like, noting that there would be a ball at the top, with 24 and 5/8 handwritten at the top and 26 and 5/8 handwritten at the base. He mentioned that with the exception of the galvanized steel finish, this flagpole would be very similar to the flagpole located at *Shurgard Storage* off of Highway 217. He referred to the historic structure located on the site, the former home of Gus and Mabel Alexander, observing that one of these individuals had been the City Clerk and the other involved in local politics during the 1800s, emphasizing that the applicant would like to tastefully represent the fact that this structure is a historic Beaverton landmark with direct ties to local history.

Observing that the landscape plan indicates that an irrigation system would neither be necessary nor installed, Ms. Shipley requested clarification of whether any provision has been proposed to make certain that the new plantings would be established.

Mr. Sotomayor advised Ms. Shipley that although *Voicestream's* contract would provide for the establishment of these new plantings, no automated irrigation system would be installed at the site. Noting that the term of the lease is 30 years, he mentioned that typically a drought-resistant type of plant would be utilized.

On question, staff had no further questions or comments.

Ms. Doukas referred to communications that had been received from Mr. Biggi, observing that he had not attended the Neighborhood Meeting.

Mr. Sotomayor verified that no member of the public had attended the Neighborhood Meeting or the Planning Commission Meeting with regard to this proposal, pointing out that the letters Mr. Biggi had submitted are not recent. He observed that although staff has had contact with this individual, there has been no direct contact with *Voicestream*.

On question, Ms. Shotwell informed Ms. Doukas that she had contacted Mr. Biggi after receiving his second letter, noting that she had advised him that the scheduled Public Hearing dates were March 27, 2002 (Planning Commission) and March 28, 2002 (Board of Design Review), rather than March 22, 2002, a date that he had indicated he would not be available. She emphasized that although Mr. Biggi is in town at this time, he had not been certain whether or not he would attend.

Mr. Sotomayor mentioned that while one of the members of the Planning Commission had indicated that this 60-foot structure would be out of character with the surrounding neighborhood, *Voicestream* respectfully submits that a flagpole with an American flag is very appropriate on the historic property in this downtown area.

At the request of Vice-Chairman Beighley, Ms. Shotwell clarified that the Planning Commission had not specifically discussed the galvanized finish proposed for the flagpole.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

On question, no member of the public testified with regard to this application.

The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Nardoza questioned whether a Condition of Approval would be included to specify the dimensions of the flag.

Vice-Chairman Beighley and Ms. Doukas agreed that the dimensions of the flag should be provided within a Condition of Approval.

Mr. Nardoza expressed his opinion that a provision providing for the installation of an approved irrigation system should be included to provide for the maintenance of the landscaping.

Vice-Chairman Beighley pointed out that while Condition of Approval No. 5 provides for the irrigation system, it might be necessary to specify that this system would be maintained for a period of three years.

Mr. Osterberg advised the members of the Board of Design Review that it is necessary to utilize their microphones properly to make certain that the tape would record their comments.

Ms. Doukas suggested that a provision for adequate watering for a three-year maintenance period should be required to ensure the longevity of all landscaping.

Mr. Nardozza expressed his opinion that a provision providing for the maintenance and physical appearance of the flag should be included in any motion for approval.

Ms. Shotwell clarified that the proposed Condition of Approval states that the flag shall be proportionate to the height of the monopole and be well maintained.

Ms. Doukas suggested that this should be more specific, providing that the size of the flag be a maximum of 10 feet by 15 feet and shall be well maintained.

Mr. Nardozza expressed his opinion that the provision should provide that the size of the flag is approximately 10 feet tall and 15 feet wide.

Ms. Doukas **MOVED** and Ms. Shipley **SECONDED** a motion for the approval of BDR 2001-0179 – Voicestream Monopole at SW 1st Street Type 3 Design Review, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearings on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated March 21, 2002, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 16, with revisions and additions, as follows:

5. The installation of an approved irrigation system shall be required to ensure the longevity of landscaping **for a three-year maintenance period.** Further, landscaping shall be maintained by weeding, pruning and replacing as necessary; and

17. The flag shall be 10 by 15 feet in dimension and well maintained.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

Mr. Osterberg suggested action on the Beaverton School District's request for a continuance of BDR 2001-0214 – Beaverton High School Cafeteria and Parking Lot Expansion Design Review.

NEW BUSINESS:

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. BDR 2001-0195 – MURRAY HILL WOODS APARTMENT PARKING LOT EXPANSION DESIGN REVIEW

This application for design review has been submitted for the expansion of a parking lot that will add 78 carport spaces to the parking lot of the existing Murray Hill Woods Apartments. The proposed parking addition will be located along a 60-foot wide strip of land west of the existing Murray Hill Woods apartments complex. The development site is generally located on the southwest corner of SW Murray Boulevard and SW Beard Road, and is more specifically identified as Tax Lot 1200 on

Washington County Assessor's Map 1S1-29D. The site is zoned R-2 (Multi-Family Urban Medium Density) and is approximately 7.86 acres in size. A decision for action on the proposed development shall be based upon the approval criteria listed in Development Code Section 40.10.15.3.C.

Mr. Whyte presented the Staff Report, observing that the background information had been provided within this document. He provided a brief description of the request and described what would be accomplished by this development. Concluding, he recommended approval, with Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 12, and offered to respond to any questions.

Vice-Chairman Beighley expressed his curiosity with regard to the proposed bicycle racks, specifically whether these bicycle racks had been suggested by staff or the applicant.

Mr. Whyte advised Vice-Chairman Beighley that parking for bicycles may be a requirement of the Development Code, noting that these are generally reflected within the Facilities Review Conditions of Approval.

APPLICANT:

RAY MOORE, representing the *Wood River Corporation*, on behalf of the applicant, observed that Bill Reed is also in attendance. Referring to the issue of bicycle parking, he clarified that his interpretation of the Development Code indicates that the applicant would be required to provide 18 short-term and 174 long-term bicycle spaces, based upon one space per unit. He provided a brief description of the site and the proposed improvements, concurred with the Conditions of Approval proposed by staff, offered to respond to questions.

Vice-Chairman Beighley referred to the landscape plan, specifically a three-foot high Douglas Fir tree, observing that the Conditions of Approval generally specify that trees are a minimum of six feet in height.

Mr. Moore assured Vice-Chairman Beighley that the trees provided by the applicant would be a minimum of six feet in height.

Ms. Shipley referred to the landscaping along the paved driveway, adjacent to the bioswale, expressing concern that the proposed lawn and small boulders set into the lawn would be difficult to maintain, particularly underneath the boulders. She suggested the possibility of defining this edge with a hedge or some other form of plant material.

Mr. Moore advised Ms. Shipley that the lawn and boulders had been proposed in an effort to prevent vehicles from driving into the swale, observing that an established hedge would also provide adequate security.

Ms. Shipley mentioned the Douglas Fir trees, pointing out that this particular type of tree has the potential to grow to large for the carport island spaces, creating a visual barrier. She noted that she would prefer deciduous trees in those spaces.

On question, Mr. Moore advised Ms. Shipley that although the ecology mix has been used for bioswale areas in the past, there has been an attempt to avoid the grasses and utilize more of the wetland species, rocks and sticks, etc.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

On question, no member of the public testified with regard to this application.

The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Whyte clarified his understanding to the Board's comments that the Douglas Fir tree would be changed to the Columnar Maple Tree in between parking, as shown, adding that he has no further comments at this time.

Ms. Shipley emphasized that she had only intended to change the Douglas Fir trees located in the carport island spaces, adding that those Douglas Fir trees in the open areas should not be an issue. She pointed out that that she would prefer a Columnar Maple Tree, adding that rather than the boulders and lawn, she would prefer a hedge along the driveway.

Vice-Chairman Beighley noted that although it is not necessary to be specific with regard to the hedge along the driveway, it should be specified whether the hedge should be evergreen, deciduous, or a combination of both.

Observing that the hedge does not necessarily need to be sight obscuring, Ms. Shipley suggested a combination of both evergreen and deciduous shrubs that would be appropriate located adjacent to a bioswale, adding that these shrubs should be four to five feet in height.

Ms. Doukas **MOVED** and Ms. Shipley **SECONDED** a motion for the approval of BDR 2001-0195 – Murray Hill Woods Apartment Parking Lot Expansion Type 3 Design Review, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearings on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated March 21, 2002, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 12.

13. Replace the proposed Douglas Fir Tree where shown within the six parking islands with a Columnar Red Maple Tree.
14. Replace the landscaping on the west side of the drive aisle with a dense hedge, combination of deciduous and evergreen, with an ultimate height of four to five feet, with plant material that is sensitive

to the adjacent bioswale. The minimum height of the six Douglas Fir Trees is to be six feet, and each of the six islands between the carports shall contain a minimum of one Columnar Red Maple Tree.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

B. BDR 2001-0213 – BEAVERTON HIGH SCHOOL CAFETERIA AND PARKING LOT EXPANSION DESIGN REVIEW

(Request for continuance)

This application for design review has been submitted for the construction of a new two-level, 30,000 square foot cafeteria building and parking area located directly north of and connecting to the existing Beaverton High School building, including associated landscaping. The development proposal is located at 13000 SW 2nd Street, and is more-specifically described as Tax Lots 11100, 11000, 02900, 07100 and 10900, Washington County Assessor's Map 1S1-16AD; and Tax Lots 02100 and 02500, Washington County Assessor's Map 1S1-16AC. The site is zoned R-10 (Urban Low Density) and is approximately 27 acres in size. A decision for action on the proposed development shall be based upon the approval criteria listed in Development Code Section 40.10.15.3.C.

Mr. Osterberg reiterated that the applicant had requested a continuance of this item until May 9, 2002.

Ms. Doukas **MOVED** and Ms. Shipley **SECONDED** a motion to continue BDR 2001-0213 – Beaverton High School Cafeteria and Parking Lot Expansion Design Review to a date certain of May 9, 2002.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

The meeting adjourned at 7:41 p.m.